

Serial No.: 10/072,429

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15 remain herein. Claim 16 is added hereby. Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 14 remain herein but are still withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants' undersigned attorney thanks Examiner Blau for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted December 30, 2004. The Examiner's Interview Summary (Form PTOL-413) fairly states the substance of the conversation in the interview. Applicants' undersigned attorney notes that most of the points mentioned in the "Continuation of Substance of Interview..." in that document were points that were discussed by Examiner Blau. Responsive to Examiner Blau's statement that "defining a set to be 3 or more clubs would make the Examiner's argument more difficult," applicants have added claim 16 to this application. Any additional arguments made during the interview by applicants' undersigned attorney are presented again in the Remarks below herein.

Serial No.: 10/072,429

1. Claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under §103(a) over Peters U.S. Patent 6,093,112 in view of Besnard U.S. Patent 5,643,112.

Neither Peters nor Besnard alone anticipates or renders obvious any of applicants' claims. While Besnard discloses one or more recesses opening through the rear face of the upper wall (of perimeter weighting in a golf club head). Besnard does not disclose or suggest varying from one club to another within a set such recesses to thereby vary the location of the center of gravity of the club heads from one club to another in such a set. Peters discloses two clubs in a pair, each of which is made from incomplete club head parts which during production temporarily have a recess in the rear surface of a lower wall, which recess during production is filled with a material more dense than the material of the incomplete club head part, thereby producing a completed club head which has no such recesses. Peters does disclose that inclusion of such more dense material in the lower wall moves the club head center of gravity downward, but Peters does not disclose varying the

Serial No.: 10/072,429

higher density weighting from club to club within a set of such clubs.

Applicants again note that the Office Action mailed December 2, 2003 expressly admitted that Peters lacks the following underscored elements of applicants' claims:

Peters lacks at least one recess in the upper wall and said at least one recess opens onto a single face of an upper wall, away from the upper and lower faces, recess being elongated in a main direction of an upper wall, a volume of the recess being between .4 and 5% of the volume of the head, at least one of volume and a position of said at least one recess inside an upper wall varies in distance relative to an upper face from one iron to another within a set causing a [center of] gravity of each head to vary in distance relative to an upper face from one iron to another, and the number of recesses or volume of recesses decreasing from long irons to short irons.

Office Action, 12/2/03, pages 3-4; emphasis added here. And see the similar admissions repeated in the paragraph at page 3, lines 15-20 of the August 16, 2004 Office Action.

Immediately before that array of admissions, the December 2, 2003 Office Action made another admission:

Peters does not specifically state that adding additional recesses or additional volume of recesses with weight inserts as shown between figures 20 and 22 would change the center of gravity....

Serial No.: 10/072,429

The same admission is made at page 3, lines 8-10 of the August 16, 2004 Office Action. Without any basis in the Peters reference, the Office Actions improperly subsumed applicants' disclosed and claimed invention into the prior skill in the art.

Immediately after the earlier quoted array of admissions, both of those Office Actions, without citing any basis in Peters itself, assumes facts to conclude that:

It would have been obvious to modify the set of irons of Peters to have at least one of volume and a position of said at least one recess inside a lower wall varies in distance relative to an upper face from one iron to another within a set to cause a center of gravity of each head to vary in distance relative to an upper face of an upper wall from one iron to another and the number of recesses or volume changing from long irons to short irons in order to have weights added more protected by being in an insert compared to being attached to a sole as show in figure 3 of Peters.

Office Action, 12/2/03, page 4. Also see page 3, last two lines, through page 4, line 4, of the August 16, 2004 Office Action. Again, without any basis in the Peters reference, the Office Actions improperly subsumed applicants' disclosed and claimed invention into the prior skill in the art.

Contrary to the erroneous statements in the Office Actions, there is no disclosure in Peters of a complete golf club head

Serial No.: 10/072,429

having any unfilled recess in the rear face of even a lower wall, let alone an upper wall as recited in applicants' present claims. In Peters, any such recess is present only in an incomplete club head. In Peters' complete club heads the recessed region of an incomplete club head is filled with an even more dense material than the remainder of the complete club head. This is the utter opposite of the structure of applicants' dependent claims 7 and 15 "wherein the recess [in the upper wall, not a lower wall] is filled with a low-density material." Peters teaches diametrically away from applicants' claimed structure.

The conclusions stated in the 12/2/03 Office Action, and in the August 16, 2004 Office Action, are not only without any basis in the Peters reference, but are inconsistent with the admissions made in the 12/2/03 Office Action, and are completely irrelevant with respect to the subject matter of some limitations in applicants' independent claim 1.

Although Peters generally raises vertical positions of the centers of gravity from a number 1 iron to a pitching wedge (column 15, lines 40 and 41), Peters does not teach or suggest that this is accomplished by varying a volume of at least one

Serial No.: 10/072,429

recess in the upper wall of the club head from one iron to another within the set. Peters discloses only that weight inserts 174 and 176 or 178 are provided in the lower wall of club heads making up only a specific two-club group of irons (second group 158) within the set as a whole. Peters does not teach complete club heads having a recess (especially no recess in the upper wall of a complete club head). Peters attaches dense inserts to form the complete club head; there is no opening or cavity in the complete club head at the locations where such inserts are attached.

There is simply no disclosure or teaching anywhere in Peters that would have suggested applicants' presently claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Besnard discloses a golf club iron wherein "the upper edge portion includes an elongated recess 3 ... which increases in the direction of the toe of the club head" (col. 3, lines 34-36). However, even though Besnard discloses an iron having at least one recess in the upper wall, Besnard fails to teach or suggest that a volume of such recess varies from one iron to

Serial No.: 10/072,429

another within the set, as expressly recited in applicants' claim 1.

Both Office Actions also expressly admit that "Besnard does not specifically disclose the volume of the recesses compared to a head volume...." Office Action, 12/02/03, page 4; also see 8/16/04, page 4, lines 8 and 9. But, immediately thereafter, the Office Action, again without citing any specific basis in the prior art (because there is none), assumes:

but clearly an artisan skilled in forming a head with a low center of gravity using recesses in an upper wall would have selected a suitable volume for the recesses in which a volume of the recess being between .4 and 5% of the volume of the head is included.

Office Action, 12/2/03, page 4; also see 8/16/04, page 4, lines 9-12. This is "clearly" nothing more than an unlawful reading into the cited reference the very subject matter of applicants' claim 8 -- which both Office Actions earlier specifically admit is not in the prior art.

The assumptions in these Office Actions, unsupported by the evidence of record, continue:

In view of the patent of Besnard it would have been obvious to modify the set of irons of Peters to have at least one recess in the upper wall instead of the lower wall....

Serial No.: 10/072,429

Office Action, 12/2/03, page 4; also see 8/16/04, page 4, line 21 through page 5, line 2. Why? Nothing in either Peters or Besnard teaches or suggests any need or desirability of such a modification.

Indeed, the use of weight inserts in the lower wall in Peters teaches away from the use of recesses in the upper wall as recited in applicants' claim 1. The use of inserts in golf club heads is the opposite of using recesses; the inserts add material and thus weight to a club head, while recesses omit material and thereby remove weight from the club head. Thus, there would be no suggestion or motivation for one skilled in the art to add a recess as in Besnard to the club head of Peters since Peters teaches diametrically away from the use of recesses by instead adding inserts to his club heads. Adding dense weight to one portion of a club head does not teach removing weight from a different part of the same club head.

In holding an invention obvious in view of a combination of references, there must be some suggestion, motivation, or teaching in the prior art that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to select the references and combine them in the way that would produce the claims invention.

Serial No.: 10/072,429

Karsten Mfg. Co. v. Cleveland Golf Co., 242 F.3d 1376, 58 USPQ2d 1285, 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The Office Actions point to no such suggestion, motivation or teaching in the prior art of record here.

That same paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the 12/2/03 Office Action, also assumes that it would have been obvious to modify Peters to have at least one recess in a single face of the upper wall wherein

volume ... of said at least one recess inside an upper wall varies in distance relative to an upper face from one iron to another within a set causing a [center of] gravity of each head to vary....

Office Action, 12/2/03, page 5. But, utterly nothing in either Peters or Besnard discloses, suggests, teaches, or motivates in the direction of this aspect of applicants' claimed invention.

Still further in that same paragraph, the 12/2/03 Office Action assumes:

In view of the patent of Besnard it would have been obvious to modify the set of irons of Peters to have a volume of the recess being between .4 and 5% of the volume of the head in order to have a sufficient amount of weight removed from a top of a head to lower the center of gravity a sufficient distance.

Serial No.: 10/072,429

Office Action, 12/2/03, page 5. Again, this is the limitation of applicants' claim 8, which the Office action admits is not present in Peters, and admits is not disclosed in Besnard. There simply is no disclosure, teaching, suggestion or motivation in either Peters or Besnard to modify any portion of either reference to render obvious this aspect of applicants' claimed invention.

There is no disclosure, teaching, suggestion or motivation in either Besnard or Peters which would have made it obvious to modify Peters' irons to have at least one recess in the upper wall thereof. And, there is nothing in either reference which would in any way suggest modifying the other reference so that the volume of any such recess in the upper wall varies from one iron to another within the set causing the center of gravity of each club head in the set to vary in distance relative to the upper face from one iron to another. The Office Action simply erroneously and unlawfully assimilates applicants' disclosed and claimed invention into the prior art, with no basis for doing so in the prior art itself.

Serial No.: 10/072,429

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under §103(a) over Peters in view of Besnard, further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication 7-213656 and Fenton U.S. Patent 5,290,036.

Claim 7 is dependent upon independent claim 1, and claim 15 is dependent upon claim 7. Accordingly, both claims 7 and 15 are patentable for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable, as explained above herein. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in either JP '656 or Fenton that discloses or suggests anything that would remedy the deficiencies in either or both of Peters and Besnard to create an effective combination of references against applicants' claimed invention.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Peters, Besnard, JP '656 or Fenton which discloses or teaches all the elements of any of applicants'

Serial No.: 10/072,429

claims. Further, there is no disclosure, teaching, suggestion or motivation in any of those references which suggests the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, all claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 is respectfully solicited.


Serial No.: 10/072,429

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

February 16, 2005
Date


Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177

RWP/ame

Attorney Docket No.: CLEV:481

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220